

<p><b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b></p>	<p><b>Application No.</b> 10/698,016</p> <p><b>Examiner</b> Thomas J. Dailey</p>	<p><b>Applicant(s)</b> FRIETSCH, THOMAS</p> <p><b>Art Unit</b> 2452</p>
<p><b>All Participants:</b> _____</p> <p>(1) <u>Thomas J. Dailey</u>. (3) _____.          (2) <u>Asok Mannava</u>. (4) _____.</p> <p><b>Date of Interview:</b> <u>3 February 2010</u>      <b>Time:</b> <u>3:30 PM EST</u></p> <p><b>Type of Interview:</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Telephonic  <input type="checkbox"/> Video Conference  <input type="checkbox"/> Personal (Copy given to: <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's representative)</p> <p>Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No          If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.</p> <p><b>Part I.</b>  <b>Rejection(s) discussed:</b>  <i>103 rejections of claims 32 and 48</i></p> <p><b>Claims discussed:</b>  <i>32 and 48</i></p> <p><b>Prior art documents discussed:</b>  <i>Barnard and Sistanizadeh</i></p> <p><b>Part II.</b>  <b>SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:</b>  <i>See Continuation Sheet</i></p> <p><b>Part III.</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  <input type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.</p>		

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner explained that after appeal conference it was concluded that, pending updated search, claim 48 may be allowable, and claim 32 rejection was still upholdable. Further the examiner explained that in order for the case to proceed to allowance, pending an updated search, claim 48 should be rolled into claim 32 and other independent claims and certain language issues regarding claim 32 would need to be corrected. For example, the applicant's use of "authentic node" and "network typography" as currently recited. Applicant indicated they would prefer to see an action on the merits. A non-final rejection is attached herewith.